UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,146	07/13/2006	Raymond Joseph Elisabeth Habets	NL040071	6749
	7590 09/01/201 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001		BITAR, NANCY		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2624		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/597,146	HABETS, RAYMOND JOSEPH ELISABETH		
Examiner	Art Unit		
NANCY BITAR	2624		

	N.	ANCY BITAR	2624	
i	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPI	LY FILED 25 August 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
appli appli	reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the ication, applicant must timely file one of the following repication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR ods:	lies: (1) an amendment, affidav (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; or	vhich places the r (3) a Request
b) 🔯 1	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing da The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advis no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	ory Action, or (2) the date set forth than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions have been f under 37 Cl set forth in (may reduce	of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on villed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens FR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shor (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). OF APPEAL	ion and the corresponding amount tened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The filing	Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complian the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extensions of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within	on thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3.	e proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but They raise new issues that would require further consic They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); They are not deemed to place the application in better	eration and/or search (see NO	TE below);	
	appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a corr NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			DTOL 224)
5.	amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. plicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): would be allowed the proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed by the proposed of a mended claim(s) would be allowed by the proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed by the propose	<u></u>		·
7. X For how The Clair Clair Clair	allowable claim(s). purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: m(s) allowed: 15. m(s) objected to: m(s) rejected: 1-6,9,12-14 and 16-18. m(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ill be entered and an e	xplanation of
	T OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
beca	affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but be ause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and su not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
ente	affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a N red because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over wing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary ar	come <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
REQUES1	e affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of <u>FFOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> erequest for reconsidered but do			
 12.				
	AM BALI/ sory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624	/Nancy Bitar/ Examiner, Art Unit 2624	ļ	

Application No.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant argues that Piet and Van Liere both disclose static measurement objects and the Piet and Van Liere, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "attaching a dynamic measurement object to a first graphic object displayed on a monitor, the dynamic measurement object including measurement data related to the first graphic object, detaching, via a user interface device, the dynamic measurement object from the first graphic object, and attaching, via the user interface device, the dynamic measurement object to a second graphic object displayed on the monitor, wherein the measurement data is modified to be related to the second graphic object," as recited in claim 1. In response, Examiner first will refer to Pet et al that teaches: A measurement template containing a set of measurement points, which graphically represents relation between measurement entities and radiological anatomy, is retrieved and displayed adjacent to the digital image. The measurement points in the template are mapped on to the displayed image to perform geometrical measurements on the image. Pet et uses the user interface The user interface consists of a database, a controller and a graphics part. The controller reacts to events such as the user pressing a mouse button or running a dialog box, starting a command, addition of an object to the database, notification and modification of objects that other objects onto which they are based have changed etc. (i.e. modification). Moreover, the dynamic measurement object is taught by Van Liere wherein the "measurement values may be displayed either discretely or continuously in the measurement values window as the user moves the position of a point over the image (see paragraph [00016]). Therefore each of Van Liere and Piet et al teaches the claim limitation.